

S/N: 10/824,406

Atty Dkt No. GP-302549 / GM0249PUS-1

### REMARKS

The following remarks are intended to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed August 3, 2005.

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Paton (GB 2207096) in view of Simmons (5,573,300). Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5.

Three basic criteria must be met to establish *prima facie* obviousness. MPEP § 2143. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine teachings. *Id.* Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* Third, the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *Id.*

Amended claims 1 and 5 recite at least one element or limitation that is neither taught nor suggested by either of Paton and Simmons, and therefore the third criterion necessary to establish *prima facie* obviousness is not satisfied. More particularly, claim 1 recites a body including "a driver interface ... to communicate vehicle control signals to the chassis from a seated driver [and] an interface ... configured for attachment to the chassis, said interface including at least one electrical connector operatively connected to the driver interface to receive the vehicle control signals." (emphasis added).

In the Office Action mailed August 3, 2005, the Examiner admits that Paton does not teach "electrical connection components." The Examiner then states that "Simmons teaches utility vehicles with interchangeable emergency response modules configured to conform to a standardized interface system wherein ... electrical 30 connection components of the body and chassis complement each other."

Applicants note that element 30 of Simmons is a "power cord." More specifically, Simmons recites that "[t]he only electrical connection to the vehicle 10 from

S/N: 10/824,406

Atty Dkt No. GP-302549 / GM0249PUS-1

the module 11 is a power cord 30.” Simmons, column 4, lines 62-63. The power cord 30 of Simmons is not “operatively connected to the driver interface to receive the vehicle control signals,” as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 recites at least one element that is neither taught nor suggested by Paton and Simmons, and, accordingly, claim 1 is allowable.

Antecedent support for the amendment of claim 1 is found, for example, in paragraphs 0073 and 0074 of the present application.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 5 recites a body including “a driver communication interface ... to communicate electronic vehicle control signals to the chassis from a vehicle driver; and ... said chassis-attachment interface including an electrical connector being operatively connected to said driver communication interface to receive said electronic vehicle control signals and being engageable with a complementary connector on the vehicle chassis.” The analysis presented *infra* for claim 1 also applies to claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is allowable.

Claims 6-11 ultimately depend from claim 5 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 5 is allowable.

#### CONCLUSION

This Amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed August 3, 2005. The amendments to the claims and the remarks in support of the amended and rejected claims are believed to place this application in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

S/N: 10/824,406

Atty Dkt No. GP-302549 / GM0249PUS-1

Respectfully submitted

**ADRIAN B. CHERNOFF ET AL**By 

Robert C. Corbett  
Reg. No. 51,089  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 2, 2005

**QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
39555 Orchard Hill Place, Suite 520  
Novi, MI 48375  
Phone: 248-380-9300  
Fax: 248-380-8968

*On behalf of:*

Kathryn A. Marra  
GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION  
Legal Staff Mail Code 482-C23-B21  
P.O. Box 300  
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000